85

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,325	04/13/2001	Craig S.K. Clapp	SDAC-P01-072	5531

29855 7590 06/07/2006

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.
20333 SH 249
SUITE 600
HOUSTON, TX 77070

EXAMINER	
RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2614	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/834,325	CLAPP ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melur Ramakrishnaiah	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 24-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15, 24-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6-29-01,12-12-03*. 5-16-06
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11, 13-15, 24-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam et al. (US2001/0042114A1, filed 2-19-1998, hereinafter Agraharam) in view of Hisayoshi (JP2000-184104).

Regarding claim 1, Agraharam discloses a video conferencing system comprising a main unit, the main unit (40, fig. 4) including a device interface in (40, fig. 4), a camera adapter in (40, fig. 4), a processor (43, fig. 4), and memory in (40, fig. 4), the device interface including one or more ports adapted to provide an output to a device or receive input from a device, the processor and memory configured to perform video conferencing functions, the camera adapter configured to removably to receive a camera (46/47, fig. 4) unit that provides audio and video signals to the main unit through the camera adapter , the processor of the main unit programmed to process the audio signals and in response to the audio signals to generate control signals to control at least one of the direction or zoom of the camera, (10, fig. 1; paragraphs: 0034-0035; 0028-0029).

Regarding claim 24, Agraharam discloses a video conferencing system comprising a main unit, the main unit (40, fig. 4), a processor (43, fig. 4), memory (not shown), the device interface including one or more ports (for example ports for

connecting camera, microphone, speaker etc in fig. 4) adapted to provide an output to a device or receive an input from a device, the processor and memory configured to perform video conferencing functions (fig. 1; paragraphs: 0034-0035; 0028-0029).

Agraharam differs from claimed invention with respect to claims 1, 4, and 24 in that although he teaches a connector (48, fig. 4) for connecting to the network, he does not specifically teach the following: the docking station adaptor configured to removably couple to a docking station that connects in a communicating relationship with video conferencing network.

However, Hisayoshi discloses adapter device, image pickup device, and image pickup system provided with these devices which teaches the following: the docking station adaptor configured to removably couple to a docking station that connects in a communicating relationship with video network (Drawing 1, abstract, paragraphs: 21-22).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Agraharam's system to provide for the following: the docking station adaptor configured to removably couple to a docking station that connects in a communicating relationship with video conferencing network as this arrangement would provide one of the methods, among many possible methods, for interfacing equipment to the communication system as taught by Hisayoshi.

Regarding claims 2, 5-9, 11, 13-15, 25, Agraharam further teaches the following: device interface provides a connection to one or more video conferencing peripherals as shown in fig. 4, comprising a camera unit (46, fig. 4) removably electrically and

mechanically connected to the main unit (40, fig. 4) and connected in a communicating relationship with the main unit through camera adapter, circuitry for converting video conference data between a first format compatible with the video conferencing network and second format with a station adapter (this step is implicit in as much as the reference teaches video conferencing unit connecting to different networks, paragraph: 0028), at least one of station or the camera unit receive power from the main unit, mass storage device (not shown) that stores a program implementing one or more video conferencing protocols, one or more video conferencing peripherals includes one of speakers (45, fig. 4) a microphone (47, fig. 4), video monitor (44, fig. 4), a camera (46, fig. 4), etc, video conferencing functions include coding and decoding of audio data and coding and decoding of video data, providing a user interface (44, 42, 41, fig. 4) to a user of the system, controllable direction includes a controllable pan and tilt, network port includes one of a data network port or a telecommunication port , network port includes at least one of digital subscriber line port, an integrated services digital network port, etc (this is implied in as much as the reference teaches video conferencing unit in fig. 4 can be connected to different networks, paragraph: 0028), one or more processors (43, fig. 4) that support processing of audio or video data in a video conference, one of the one or more ports is connected to camera (46, fig. 4; paragraphs: 0034-0035; 0028-0029).

3. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over over Agraharam in view of Hisayoshi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nakamura (JP410042264A

The combination differs from claims 3 and 10 in that it does not teach the following: camera including a plurality of microphones that provide audio signals to the main unit and a camera that provides the video signals to the main unit, the camera including at least one of a controllable direction or a controllable zoom responsive to the control signals generated by the main unit, plurality of microphones have a predetermined locations relative to the camera, the processor of the main unit calculating a location of an audio source relative to the camera using a predetermined locations of plurality of microphones and an audio signal received from each of the plurality of microphones, and processor responsively generating control signals to the camera to steer the camera to the location of the audio source.

However, Nakamura discloses a video conference system which teaches the following: camera including a plurality of microphones that provide audio signals to the main unit and a camera that provides the video signals to the main unit, the camera including at least one of a controllable direction or a controllable zoom responsive to the control signals generated by the main unit, plurality of microphones (3, 4, fig. 1) have a predetermined locations relative to the camera, the processor of the main unit calculating a location of an audio source relative to the camera using a predetermined locations of plurality of microphones and an audio signal received from each of the plurality of microphones, and processor responsively generating control signals to the camera to steer the camera to the location of the audio source (fig. 1, see abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: camera

including a plurality of microphones that provide audio signals to the main unit and a camera that provides the video signals to the main unit, the camera including at least one of a controllable direction or a controllable zoom responsive to the control signals generated by the main unit, plurality of microphones have a predetermined locations relative to the camera, the processor of the main unit calculating a location of an audio source relative to the camera using a predetermined locations of plurality of microphones and an audio signal received from each of the plurality of microphones, and processor responsively generating control signals to the camera to steer the camera to the location of the audio source as this arrangement gives another method for controlling camera to turn to the speaking participant so that his image can be used for display to recognize the speaker as taught by Nakamura.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Hisayoshi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kirby et al. (US PAT: 5,925,117, hereinafter Kirby) and Helot et al. (US PAT: 6,628, 517, filed 4-11-2000, hereinafter Helot).

Regarding claim 12, the combination does not explicitly teach the following: docking station includes at least one of a peripheral component interface, a multi-vendor protocol card etc.

However, Kirby teaches the following: a multi-vendor protocol card (fig. 2, col. 12 lines 24-28); and Helot teaches the following: peripheral component interface (fig. 1, col. 3 lines 31-64).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: docking station includes at least one of a peripheral component interface, a multi-vendor protocol card etc as this arrangement would provide additional functionality for portable computer of Agraharam so that additional functionally can be achieved by connecting the portable computer docking system as taught by Kirby and Hellot.

5. Claims 26-30, 32-33are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Hellot and Kirby.

Regarding claim 26, Agraharam discloses a modular video conferencing system comprising: a main unit (40, fig. 4) which comprises camera adapter configured to removably electrically and mechanically attach to a camera unit (46, fig. 4), a camera unit comprising: a camera (46, fig. 4), and an adapter that is removably and mechanically attachable to the main unit (this is implicit in as much as the reference teaches an external camera 46 connected to the main unit in fig. 4).

Agraharam differs from claims 26-27, 29, in that he does not teach the following: a docking station adapter configured to remiovably electrically and mechanically attach to a docking station, the docking station comprising: a first adapter configured to removably electrically and mechanically connect to the main unit, and a second adapter configured to be connected in a communicating relationship with a video conferencing network, a first adapter including a locking mechanism to prevent separation of the main unit from the docking station, docking station receives power from the main unit.

However, Hellot and Kirby teaches the following: a docking station adapter configured to remiovably electrically and mechanically attach to a docking station, the docking station comprising: a first adapter configured to removably electrically and mechanically connect to the main unit, and a second adapter configured to be connected in a communicating relation ship with a video conferencing network, a first adapter including a locking mechanism to prevent separation of the main unit from the docking station, docking station receives power from the main unit (fig. 2 col. 12 lines 24-28 of Kirby; figs. 1-2, col. 4 lines 15-59 0f Hellot).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Agraharam's system to provide for the following: a docking station adapter configured to remiovably electrically and mechanically attach to a docking station, the docking station comprising: a first adapter configured to removably electrically and mechanically connect to the main unit, and a second adapter configured to be connected in a communicating relation ship with a video conferencing network, a first adapter including a locking mechanism to prevent separation of the main unit from the docking station, docking station receives power from the main unit as this arrangement would provide additional functionality for portable computer of Agraharam so that additional functionally can be achieved by connecting the portable computer to docking system as taught by Kirby and Hellot.

Regarding claims 28, 30, 32-33, Agraharam further teaches the following: camera unit (46, fig. 4) further comprises at least one microphone (47, fig. 4), the camera (46, fig. 4) is responsive to control signals to change one or more of pan, tilt,

focus, or zoom camera, and the main unit (40, fig. 4) provides control signals to the camera unit so as to point the camera toward a desired location, camera adapter comprises a locking mechanism to prevent separation of the camera unit from the main unit (this reads on connector connecting the camera 46 to the main unit 40 as shown in fig 4), main unit further comprises for storing and executing video conferencing functions paragraphs: 0034-0035; 0028-0029).

6. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Hellot and Kirby as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Nakamura.

The combination differs from claim 31 in that it does not teach the following: plurality of microphones having a predetermined locations relative to the camera, the microphones provide audio signals to the main unit, whereby the main unit determine the location of sound source, and desired location is the location of the sound source.

However, Nakamura teaches the following: plurality of microphones (3/4, fig. 1) having a predetermined locations relative to the camera (2, fig. 1), the microphones provide audio signals to the main unit, whereby the main unit determine the location of sound source, and desired location is the location of the sound source (see abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: plurality of microphones having a predetermined locations relative to the camera, the microphones provide audio signals to the main unit, whereby the main unit determine the location of sound source, and desired location is the location of the sound source as this

arrangement gives another method for controlling camera to turn to the speaking participant so that his image can be used for display to recognize the speaker as taught by Nakamura.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, 24-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Melur Ramakr.

Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643